arXiv:1604.00161v1 [math-ph] 1 Apr 2016

Non-self-adjoint hamiltonians defined by generalized Riesz bases

Hiroshi Inoue and Mayumi Takakura

Abstract

In [2], F. Bagarello, A. Inoue and C. Trapani investigated some operators defined by Riesz bases. These operators connect with *quasi-hermitian quantum mechanics*, and its relatives. In this paper, we change the frameworks of these operators, and then almost results obtained in [2] become trivial. Furthermore, we introduce a notion of generalized Riesz bases which is a generalization of Riesz bases and investigate some operators defined by generalized Riesz bases.

1 Introduction

In [2], F. Bagarello, A. Inoue and C. Trapani investigated the operators

$$\begin{aligned} H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \phi_n \otimes \bar{\psi}_n, \\ A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} \phi_n \otimes \bar{\psi}_{n+1}, \\ B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} \phi_{n+1} \otimes \bar{\psi}_n, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\phi_n\}$ is a Riesz basis, that is, there exist a bounded operator T on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with bounded inverse and an ONB $\{e_n\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\phi_n = Te_n,\ n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, and $\psi_n \equiv (T^{-1})^* e_n,\ n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Then $\{\phi_n\}$ is biorthogonal to $\{\psi_n\}$, that is, $(\phi_n|\psi_m) = \delta_{nm}$ $(n, m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots)$. These operators connect with *quasi-hermitian quantum mechanics*, and its relatives [7, 8, 9].

In this paper, we generalize some of the results for the above operators defined by Riesz bases. In details, we consider the case that an operator T and its inverse T^{-1} in definition of Riesz bases are not necessary bounded. And we define and study the following operators

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &\equiv T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_n e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1},\\ A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &\equiv T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1} e_n\otimes\bar{e}_{n+1}\right)T^{-1},\\ B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &\equiv T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1} e_{n+1}\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

instead of the operators $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$, $A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ and $B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$. In fact, in case that T and T^{-1} are bounded, these operators $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ coincide with the operators $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$, $A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ and $B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$, respectively and almost results in [2] are easily proved using $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ instead of $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$, $A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ and $B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$. Furthermore, though these operators do not equal in general, it seems to be much simpler and better for calculations and clearness to consider the operators $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ than the operators $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$, $A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ and $B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$. So, we investigate the operators $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ in details.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce a notion of generalized Riesz bases which is a generalization of Riesz bases and investigate some operators defined by generalized Riesz bases. In particular we characterize domains and adjoints and compare $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ with $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$. In Section 3, we construct and study generalized rising and lowering operators $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ defined by generalized Riesz bases.

2 Some operators defined by generalized Riesz bases

Let T be a densely defined closed linear operator in $\mathcal{H}$ with a densely defined inverse. Then T^* has a densely defined inverse and $(T^*)^{-1}=(T^{-1})^*$. Indeed, since the range $R(T)$ of T is dense in $\mathcal{H}$, it follows that $kerT^*=\{0\}$ and $R(T^*)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$. Furthermore, $(\xi|\eta)=(T^{-1}T\xi|\eta)=(T\xi|(T^{-1})^*\eta)$ for each $\eta\in D((T^{-1})^*)$, we have $(T^{-1})^*\eta\in D(T^*)$ and $T^*(T^{-1})^*\eta=\eta$, which

implies that $(T^{-1})^* \subset (T^*)^{-1}$. The inverse $(T^*)^{-1} \subset (T^{-1})^*$ is similarly shown. We generalize the notion of Riesz base as follows:

Definition 2.1. A sequence $\{\phi_n\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ is called a generalized Riesz base if there exists a densely defined closed operator T in $\mathcal{H}$ with a densely defined inverse and there exists an ONB $\{e_n\}$ in $\mathcal{H}$ contained in $D(T) \cap D((T^*)^{-1})$ such that
(i) $\phi_n = Te_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots,$
(ii) linear span D_ϕ of $\{\phi_n = Te_n\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$,
(iii) linear span D_ψ of $\{\psi_n \equiv (T^{-1})^* e_n\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$.

Remark: (1) If $\{\phi_n\}$ is a Riesz base, that is, both T and T^{-1} in Definition 2.1 are bounded, then the conditions (ii) and (iii) in Definition 2.1 hold automatically.
(2) If T in Definition 2.1 is bounded, then (ii) holds automatically.
(3) If T^{-1} in Definition 2.1 is bounded, then (iii) holds automatically.

In general case, though $R(T)$ and $R(T^*)$ are dense in $\mathcal{H}$, (ii) and (iii) do not necessarily hold. As shown later, the assumption (ii) is necessary that the operators $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ are densely defined, and the assumption (iii) is necessary that the operators $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger$, $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger$ are densely defined.
Suppose that $\{\phi_n\}$ is a generalized Riesz base. Then $\{\phi_n\}$ is biorthogonal to $\{\psi_n\}$, that is, $(\phi_n|\psi_m) = \delta_{nm}$, $n, m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Furthermore, we have the following

Lemma 2.2. Let $T^* = U|T^*|$ be a polar decomposition of T^* and $e'_n \equiv U^* e_n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Then $\{e'_n\}$ is an ONB in $\mathcal{H}$, $\phi_n = |T^*|e'_n$ and $\psi_n = |T^*|^{-1} e'_n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$.

Proof. It is well known in [1] that U is a partial isometry, $|T^*|$ is a positive self-adjoint operator in $\mathcal{H}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} U^*U &= \text{projection on } \overline{R(|T^*|)} \\ &= \text{projection on } \overline{R(T)}, \\ UU^* &= \text{projection on } \overline{R(T^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\overline{R(T)} = \overline{R(T^*)} = \mathcal{H}$ as shown above, it follows that U is unitary.

Since U is a unitary operator on $\mathcal{H}$, it follows that $\{e'_n \equiv U^* e_n\}$ is an

ONB in $\mathcal{H}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_n &= Te_n = |T^*|U^*e_n \\ &= |T^*|e'_n.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_n &= \left(T^{-1}\right)^* e_n = \left(T^*\right)^1 e_n \\ &= |T^*|^{-1}U^*e_n = |T^*|^{-1}e'_n.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

By Lemma 2.2, we may assume that an operator T in definition of generalized Riesz base is a positive self-adjoint operator without loss of generality. Let $\{\phi_n\}$ be a generalized Riesz base, that is, $\phi_n = Te_n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, where $\{e_n\}$ is an ONB in $\mathcal{H}$ and T is a positive self-adjoint operator in $\mathcal{H}$ with inverse T^{-1} whose domains $D(T)$ and $D(T^{-1})$ contain $\{e_n\}$. We put $\psi_n = T^{-1}e_n$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$. Then $\{\phi_n\}$ is biorthogonal to $\{\psi_n\}$.

Throughout this section, let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \{\alpha_n\}$ be any sequence of complex numbers. We define two operators

$$H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right) T^{-1}$$

and

$$H_{\phi,\psi}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \phi_n \otimes \bar{\psi}_n,$$

where the tensor $x \otimes \bar{y}$ of elements x, y of $\mathcal{H}$ is defined by

$$(x \otimes \bar{y})\,\xi = (\xi|y)\,x, \quad \xi \in \mathcal{H}.$$

It is easily shown that $x \otimes \bar{y}$ is a bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying $(x \otimes \bar{y})^* = y \otimes \bar{x}$ and $\|x \otimes \bar{y}\| = \|x\|\|y\|$. In details, the operators $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and

$H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} D(H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) &= \{\xi \in D(T^{-1}) \ ; \ T^{-1}\xi \in D\left(\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right)\right) \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{and } \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right) T^{-1}\xi \in D(T)\} \\ &= \{\xi \in D(T^{-1}) \ ; \ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \left(T^{-1}\xi | e_n\right) e_n \text{ exists in } \mathcal{H} \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{and it belongs to } D(T)\} \\ H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\xi &= T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right) T^{-1}\xi, \quad \xi \in D(H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

$$\begin{cases} D(H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}) &= \{\xi \in \mathcal{H}; \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \left(\xi|\psi_n\right) \phi_n \text{ exists in } \mathcal{H}\} \\ H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\xi &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \left(\xi|\psi_n\right) \phi_n, \quad \xi \in D(H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}). \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

We first compare with operators $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$. By (2.1), $\xi \in D\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n \phi_n \otimes \bar{\psi}_n\right)$ if and only if

$$\xi \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad T\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_k (\xi|T^{-1}e_k)e_k\right) \quad \text{converges in } \mathcal{H}. \tag{2.3}$$

Then, in general

$$\xi \notin D(T^{-1})$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_k (\xi|T^{-1}e_k)e_k \ \text{ does not converge in } \mathcal{H}.$$

Hence it follows from (2.1) that $\xi \notin D\left(T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right) T^{-1}\right)$ in general. On the other hand, if $\xi \in D\left(T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right) T^{-1}\right)$, then $\xi \in D(T^{-1})$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_k (\xi|T^{-1}e_k)e_k$ converges in $\mathcal{H}$ and furthermore

$$T\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_k (\xi|T^{-1}e_k)e_k\right) \quad \text{converges weakly in } \mathcal{H}$$

in the following sense:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\xi \ \middle| \ T\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_k (\xi|T^{-1}e_k)e_k\right)\right) = (\xi|\eta), \quad {}^{\forall}\xi \in D(T)$$

for some $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$.
But, $T\sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_k (\xi|T^{-1}e_k)e_k$ does not necessary converge in $\mathcal{H}$. Hence, $\xi \notin$

$D\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_n\phi_n\otimes\bar{\psi}_n\right)$ in general. Thus, the operators $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ are different. But, under certain assumptions for operators T and T^{-1} we have the following relations between $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$.

Proposition 2.3. The following statements hold.
(1) $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ and $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ are densely defined linear operators in $\mathcal{H}$.
(2) If $\{\phi_n\}$ is a Riesz base, that is, both T and T^{-1} are bounded, then $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}=H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$.
(3) If T is unbounded and T^{-1} is bounded, then $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\subset H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$.

Proof. (1) Since $D(H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi})$ and $D(H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$ contain $\{\phi_n\}$ and D_ϕ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$, it follows that $H_{\phi,\psi}$ and $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ are densely defined linear operators in $\mathcal{H}$.
(2) Since T and T^{-1} are bounded, by (2.1) and (2.2) we have $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}=H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$.
(3) Take an arbitrary $\xi\in D(H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi})$. Then we have

$$H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\xi=\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{k=0}^{n}\alpha_k(\xi|\psi_k)\phi_k=\lim_{n\to\infty}T\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n}\alpha_k e_k\otimes\bar{e}_k\right)T^{-1}\xi. \tag{2.4}$$

Since T^{-1} is bounded, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n}\alpha_k e_k\otimes\bar{e}_k\right)T^{-1}\xi &= \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_n e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\xi\\ &= T^{-1}H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\xi.\end{aligned}$$

Hence it follows from (2.4) and the closedness of T that $\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_n e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\xi\in D(T)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_n e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\xi &= TT^{-1}H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\xi\\ &= H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\xi.\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\subset T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_n e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}=H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$. □

As shown in Proposition 2.3, in case that $\{\phi_n\}$ is a Riesz base, $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}=H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$. By using $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ instead of $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$, all of the results in [2] are almost trivial.
It is easily shown that $H^{*}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\supset T^{-1}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\bar{\alpha}_n e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T$. Hence we put

$$H^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\equiv T^{-1}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\bar{\alpha}_n e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T.$$

Then we have the following

Proposition 2.4. The following statements hold.
(1) If $\{\phi_n\}$ is a Riesz base, then $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^* = H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger$.
(2) If T is unbounded and T^{-1} is bounded, then $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is closed, but $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger$ is not necessary closed.
(3) If T is bounded and T^{-1} is unbounded, then $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger$ is closed, but $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is not necessary closed.

Proof. (1) Take an arbitrary $\eta \in D(H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^*)$. Then there exists an element ζ of $\mathcal{H}$ such that

$$(H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\xi \mid \eta) = \left(T \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n \right) T^{-1}\xi \mid \eta \right) = (\xi \mid \zeta)$$

for all $\xi \in D(H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$. Since $\xi \equiv Te_n \in D(H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, we have $\bar{\alpha}_n T\eta = T\zeta$. Hence it follows since T and T^{-1} are bounded that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T^{-1} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} \bar{\alpha}_k e_k \otimes \bar{e}_n \right) T\eta = T^{-1} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n} (T\zeta | e_k) e_k = \zeta,$$

which implies $\eta \in D(H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger)$ and $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger \eta = \zeta$. Thus we have $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^* = H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^\dagger$.
(2) Take any sequence $\{\xi_n\}$ in $D\left(T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right) T^{-1}\right)$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \xi_n = \xi$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k e_k \otimes \bar{e}_k \right) T^{-1}\xi_n = \eta. \tag{2.5}$$

Since T^{-1} is bounded, it follows that $\lim_{n\to\infty} T^{-1}\xi_n = T^{-1}\xi$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T^{-1}T \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k e_k \otimes \bar{e}_k \right) T^{-1}\xi_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k e_k \otimes \bar{e}_k \right) T^{-1}\xi_n = T^{-1}\eta,$$

which implies since $\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right)$ is closed that $T^{-1}\xi \in D\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right)$ and

$$\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n \right) T^{-1}\xi = T^{-1}\eta. \tag{2.6}$$

Hence we have by the closedness of T, $T^{-1}\eta \in D(T)$ and $TT^{-1}\eta = \eta$. Thus we have by (2.5) and (2.6)

$$\xi \in D\left(T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\right)$$

and

$$T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_n e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\xi = TT^{-1}\eta = \eta.$$

From the above, $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is closed. Furthermore, by the definition of $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{\dagger}$, $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^{\dagger}$ is not necessary closed.
(3) This is proved similarly to (2). □

3 Generalized lowering and rising operators defined by generalized Riesz bases

In this section, we define and study generalized lowering and rising operators defined by generalized Riesz bases:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &= T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}e_n \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)T^{-1}, \\ B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &= T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\phi,\psi}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}\phi_n \otimes \bar{\psi}_{n+1}, \\ B_{\phi,\psi}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}\phi_{n+1} \otimes \bar{\psi}_n. \end{aligned}$$

In detail, the operators $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ and $B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} D(A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) &= \{\xi \in D(T^{-1})\ ;\ T^{-1}\xi \in D\left(\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} e_n \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)\right) \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{and } \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} e_n \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right) T^{-1}\xi \in D(T)\} \\ &= \{\xi \in D(T^{-1})\ ;\ \sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_{k+1} \left(T^{-1}\xi | e_{k+1}\right) e_k \text{ converges in } \mathcal{H} \text{ as } n \to \infty \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{and it belongs to } D(T)\} \\ &= \{\xi \in D(T^{-1})\ ;\ \sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_{k+1} \left(T^{-1}\xi | e_{k+1}\right) e_k \text{ converges in } \mathcal{H} \text{ as } n \to \infty \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{and } T\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_{k+1} \left(T^{-1}\xi | e_{k+1}\right) e_k\right) \text{converges weakly in } \mathcal{H} \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{as } n \to \infty\} \\ A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\xi &= T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} e_n \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right) T^{-1}\xi, \quad \xi \in D(A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} D(B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) &= \{\xi \in D(T^{-1})\ ;\ T^{-1}\xi \in D\left(\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n}\right)\right) \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{and } \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n}\right) T^{-1}\xi \in D(T)\} \\ &= \{\xi \in D(T^{-1})\ ;\ \sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_{k+1} \left(T^{-1}\xi | e_{k}\right) e_{k+1} \text{ converges in } \mathcal{H} \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{as } n \to \infty \text{ and it belongs to } D(T)\} \\ &= \{\xi \in D(T^{-1})\ ;\ \sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_{k+1} \left(T^{-1}\xi | e_{k}\right) e_{k+1} \text{ converges in } \mathcal{H} \text{ as } n \to \infty \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{and } T\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n} \alpha_{k+1} \left(T^{-1}\xi | e_{k}\right) e_{k+1}\right) \text{converges weakly in } \mathcal{H} \\ & \qquad\qquad \text{as } n \to \infty\} \\ B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\xi &= T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n}\right) T^{-1}\xi, \quad \xi \in D(B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} D(A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}) &= \{\xi \in \mathcal{H}; \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} \left(\xi | \psi_{n+1}\right) \phi_n \text{ exists in } \mathcal{H}\} \\ A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\xi &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} \left(\xi | \psi_{n+1}\right) \phi_n, \quad \xi \in D(A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} D(B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}) &= \{\xi \in \mathcal{H}; \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} \left(\xi | \psi_{n}\right) \phi_{n+1} \text{ exists in } \mathcal{H}\} \\ B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}\xi &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_{n+1} \left(\xi | \psi_{n}\right) \phi_{n+1}, \quad \xi \in D(B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}). \end{cases}$$

As shown in case of $H_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $H^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ in Section 2, $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ are different and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ are also different. But, under some conditions for T and T^{-1}

we have following

Proposition 3.1. The following statements hold.
(1) $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ and $B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ are densely defined linear operators in $\mathcal{H}$.
(2) If $\{\phi_n\}$ is a Riesz base, then $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi}$.
(3) If T is unbounded and T^{-1} is bounded, then $A^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi} \subset A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_{\phi,\psi} \subset B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$.

Proof. These are proved similarly to Proposition 2.3. □

To investigate the operators $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ we define operators $A^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &= T^{-1}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{\alpha}_{n+1} e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_n\right) T, \\ B^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} &= T^{-1}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{\alpha}_{n+1} e_n \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right) T. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $A^{*}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \supset A^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B^{*}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \supset B^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, furthermore we have following

Proposition 3.2. The following statements hold.
(1) If $\{\phi_n\}$ is a Riesz base, then $A^{*}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = A^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B^{*}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = B^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$.
(2) If T is unbounded and T^{-1} is bounded, then $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ are closed, but $A^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ are not necessary closed.
(3)If T is bounded and T^{-1} is unbounded, then $A^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B^{\dagger}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ are closed, but $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ are not necessary closed.

Proof. The statements (1), (2) and (3) are proved similarly to (1), (2) and (3) in Proposition 2.4, respectively.

Since the relevance of these operators $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ relies essentially on their products, we give the following

Theorem 3.3. The following statements hold.
(1) $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \subset T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^2_{n+1} e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n\right) T^{-1}$.
(2) $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \subset T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^2_{n+1} e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right) T^{-1}$.
(3) $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \subset T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^2_{n+1} e_n \otimes \bar{e}_n - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^2_{n+1} e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right) T^{-1}$.

Proof.
(1) By the definition of the operators $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) &= \left\{\xi \in D(T^{-1}); T^{-1}\xi \in D\left(\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}e_{n+1}\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)\right)\right. \\ &\qquad \text{and } \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}e_{n+1}\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\xi \in D(T) \\ &\qquad \left.\text{and } \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\xi \in D(T)\right\} \\ &\subset \left\{\xi \in D(T^{-1}); \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\xi \in D(T)\right\} \\ &= D\left(T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\xi = T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}\xi, \quad {}^{\forall}\xi \in D(A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}).$$

Hence,

$$A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \subset T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2e_n\otimes\bar{e}_n\right)T^{-1}.$$

(2) By the definition of the operators $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) &= \left\{\xi \in D(T^{-1}); T^{-1}\xi \in D\left(\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}e_n \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)\right)\right. \\ &\qquad \text{and } \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}e_n \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)T^{-1}\xi \in D(T) \\ &\qquad \left.\text{and } \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2 e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)T^{-1}\xi \in D(T)\right\} \\ &\subset \left\{\xi \in D(T^{-1}); \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2 e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)T^{-1}\xi \in D\left(T\right)\right\} \\ &= D\left(T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2 e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)T^{-1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\xi = T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2 e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)T^{-1}\xi, \quad {}^{\forall}\xi \in D(B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}).$$

Hence,

$$B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \subset T\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\alpha_{n+1}^2 e_{n+1} \otimes \bar{e}_{n+1}\right)T^{-1}.$$

(3) This follows from (1) and (2). □

Putting $\alpha_n = \sqrt{n}$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, we denote $A_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and $B_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ by A and B, respectively. By Theorem 3.3 (3), we have the following

Corollary 3.3. $AB - BA \subset I$.

Example 3.4. Let π_s be the Schrödinger representation of the CCR-algebra generated by self-adjoint elements p and q satisfying the Heisenberg commutation relation $pq - qp = -i1$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\pi_s(p)f\right)(t) &= -i\frac{d}{dt}f(t), \\ \left(\pi_s(p)g\right)(t) &= tf(t), \quad f \in S(\boldsymbol{R}), \end{aligned}$$

where $S(\boldsymbol{R})$ is the space of infinitely differentiable rapidly decreasing functions on $\boldsymbol{R}$, see [5],[6]. Let $\{f_n\}$ be an ONB in the Hilbert space $L^2(\boldsymbol{R})$ contained in $S(\boldsymbol{R})$ defined by

$$f_n(t) = \pi^{-\frac{1}{4}} (2^n n!)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(t - \frac{d}{dt} \right)^n e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots .$$

Then, putting $a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(q + ip)$, the following

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_s(aa^*) f_n &= (n+1) f_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2 \cdots , \\ \pi_s(a) f_n &= \begin{cases} 0 & , \quad n = 0, \\ \sqrt{n} f_{n-1} & , \quad n = 1, 2, \cdots , \end{cases} \\ \pi_s(a^*) f_n &= \sqrt{n+1} f_{n+1}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \cdots , \end{aligned}$$

hold, and so the number operator H_0, the lowering operator A_0 and the rising operator A_0^* as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n+1)\ f_n \otimes \bar{f}_n, \\ A_0 &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{n+1}\ f_n \otimes \bar{f}_{n+1}, \\ A_0^* &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{n+1}\ f_{n+1} \otimes \bar{f}_n. \end{aligned}$$

For any positive self-adjoint operator T in $L^2(\boldsymbol{R})$ with inverse whose domains $D(T)$ and $D(T^{-1})$ contain $\{f_n\}$, non self-adjoint hamiltonian $H \equiv T H_0 T^{-1}$, the generalized lowering operator $A \equiv T A_0 T^{-1}$ and the generalized rising operator $B \equiv T A_0^* T^{-1}$ are considered as stated here. In particular, if the domain of T contains $S(\boldsymbol{R})$, then the domains of H, A and B contain $TS(\boldsymbol{R})$, and if the domain of T^{-1} contain $S(\boldsymbol{R})$, then the domains of $H^\dagger$, $A^\dagger$ and $B^\dagger$ contain $T^{-1}S(\boldsymbol{R})$. Indeed, this follows since $S(\boldsymbol{R})$ is an invariant subspace for H_0, A_0 and B_0. A subspace $\mathcal{D}$ is called invariant for an operator X if $\mathcal{D} \subset D(X)$ and $X\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}$. Furthermore, if $S(\boldsymbol{R})$ is invariant for T and T^{-1}, equivalently $TS(\boldsymbol{R}) = S(\boldsymbol{R})$, then $S(\boldsymbol{R})$ is an invariant subspace for H, A and B and their adjoints $H^\dagger$, $A^\dagger$ and $B^\dagger$. Hence, a $*$-algebra generated by the restrictions of these operators to $S(\boldsymbol{R})$ is considered. In this case, we may easily treat with the operators H, A and B.

We think that these operators may be useful for studies of *quasi-hermitian quantum mechanics* and its relatives.

References

[1] M. Reed and B. Simon", Methods of modern Mathmatical Physics, vol. I, Academic Press, New York, 1980

[2] F. Bagarello and A. Inoue and C. Trapani, Non-self-adjoint hamiltonians defined by Riesz bases, J. Math. Phys., **55**(2014), 033501

[3] F. Bagarello, More mathematics for pseudo-bosons, J. Math. Phys., **58**(2013), 063512

[4] F. Bagarello, Pseudobosons, Riesz bases, and coherent states, J. Math. Phys., **51**(2010), 023531

[5] R.T. Powers , Self-adjoint algebras of unbounded operators, Comm. Math. Phys., **21**(1971), 85-124

[6] R.T. Powers, Algebras of Unbounded operators, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., **38**(1982), 389-406

[7] A. Mostafazadeh, Pseudo-Hermitian representatoion of Quantum Mechanics , Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys., **7**(2010), 1191-1306 ,

[8] F. Bagarello, (Regular) pseudo-bosons versus bosons, Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys. A, **44**(2011), 015205

[9] F. Bagarello , From self to non self-adjoint harmonic oscillators: physical consequences and mathematical pitfalls, Phys. Rev. A, **88**(2013), 032120

Graduate School of Mathematics, Kyushu University, 744 Motooka, Nishi-ku, Fukuoka 819-0395, Japan
h-inoue@math.kyushu-u.ac.jp,

Department of Applied Mathematics, Fukuoka University, Fukuoka 814-0180, Japan
mayumi@fukuoka-u.ac.jp,